

**FEEDBACK SURVEY ON PARCC GRADE- AND SUBJECT-SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE LEVEL DESCRIPTORS
ENGLISH**

1. Please identify your state:

Louisiana

2. Affiliation or Organization/Institution

Statewide Teams: Teams composed of faculty from across the State (who were also members of PARCC Campus Leadership Teams) met in groups of 8 at a statewide meeting during May 2013 and reached consensus when developing statewide team responses for the questions on the feedback survey.

Campus Teams: PARCC Campus Leadership Teams composed of faculty at individual campuses met on their campuses during May 2013 and reached consensus when develop campus responses for the questions on the feedback survey.

3. Are you submitting this feedback on behalf of yourself or for a group?

Group

4. How many people in the group provided input to this survey response?

Statewide Teams: 5 groups with 6-8 people per group

Campus Teams: 10 campuses with 1-6 people per PARCC Campus Leadership Team

5. Please check all of the appropriate boxes to describe yourself or members of the group.

K-8 educators

High school educators

High school administrators

Community college faculty members

Community college administrators

4-year college or university faculty members in a college of arts and sciences

4-year college or university administrators in a college of arts and sciences

4-year college or university faculty members in a school of education

4-year college or university faculty administrators in a school of educator

Member of a PARCC Work or Leadership Groups

Parent

6. I am completing this survey for

English

7. Please indicate the grade level for which you are providing feedback

Grades 9, 10, & 11

NOTE: THE NUMBERS BELOW INDICATE THE NUMBER OF GROUPS THAT RESPONDED TO EACH QUESTION ON THE SURVEY. AS AN EXAMPLE, TWO OF THE STATEWIDE TEAMS SELECTED “TOO MUCH DETAIL,” 1 STATEWIDE TEAM SELECTED “ABOUT THE RIGHT LEVEL OF DETAIL,” AND 1 STATEWIDE TEAM DID NOT RESPOND TO THE ITEM. AT THE CAMPUS LEVEL, 2 PARCC CAMPUS LEADERSHIP TEAMS SELECTED “TOO MUCH DETAIL,” “7 PARCC CAMPUS LEADERSHIP TEAMS SELECTED “ABOUT THE RIGHT LEVEL OF DETAIL,” AND 1 PARCC CAMPUS LEADERSHIP TEAM SELECTED “NOT ENOUGH DETAIL.”

8. The draft grade-specific PLDs are an important element for the PARCC testing program, and serve several purposes. Do the PLDs contain an appropriate level of detail to meet the purposes outlined in the introductory information on PARCC’s website?

Too Much Detail	Statewide Teams: 2	Campus Teams: 4
About the right level of detail	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams: 6
Not enough detail	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams: 0
Don’t Know	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:

9. In the following questions, please rate your level of agreement with the statements regarding the success of the PLDs in meeting their intended purposes.

- A. The content of the PLDs is well-aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

Strongly Agree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams: 1
Agree	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 6
Disagree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams: 2
Strongly Disagree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Don’t Know	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams: 1

- B. The PLDs communicate what students need to demonstrate in PARCC assessments to show that they are college- and career-ready (CCR) or on-track to become CCR at the high school level, or that they are ready to engage in further studies in the content area in grades 3-8.

Strongly Agree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams: 2
Agree	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 7
Disagree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams: 1
Strongly Disagree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams:
Don’t Know	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:

- C. The PLDs provide helpful information to local educators for use in developing curricular and instructional materials.

Strongly Agree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams: 2
Agree	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 7
Disagree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams:
Strongly Disagree	Statewide Teams: 1	Campus Teams:
Don’t Know	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams: 1

- D. The PLDs provide adequate information to be used in standard setting in summer 2015.

Strongly Agree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>
Agree	<i>Statewide Teams: 3</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 8</i>
Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>
Strongly Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Don't Know	<i>Statewide Teams: 2</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>

- E. The PLDs are sufficiently detailed to inform item and rubric development.

Strongly Agree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 3</i>
Agree	<i>Statewide Teams: 3</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 7</i>
Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Strongly Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Don't Know	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>

- F. The expectations described in the PLDs are appropriate rigorous at each performance level.

Strongly Agree	<i>Statewide Teams: 2</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 4</i>
Agree	<i>Statewide Teams: 2</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 6</i>
Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Strongly Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Don't Know	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>

- G. The expectations across performance levels build appropriately within the grade level (i.e., expectations of Level 4 are an appropriate progression from the expectations at Level 3).

Strongly Agree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>
Agree	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 7</i>
Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams: 2</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Strongly Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>
Don't Know	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>

- H. The expectations of each performance level build logically across grade levels (i.e., the expectations at Level 4 in grade 7 are an appropriate progression from the expectations at Level 4 in grade 6).

Strongly Agree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams:</i>
Agree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 5</i>
<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Statewide Teams: 4</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 3</i>
Strongly Disagree	<i>Statewide Teams:</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>
Don't Know	<i>Statewide Teams: 1</i>	<i>Campus Teams: 1</i>

- I. The PLDs articulate the overall assessment claims for the PARCC summative assessment for each achievement levels

Strongly Agree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Agree	Statewide Teams: 2	Campus Teams: 5
Disagree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams: 1
Strongly Disagree	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Don't Know	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 4

9. In what way do you think that the grade specific PLDs will influence teacher expectations for the level of performance required of students in your state?

Increase Expectations	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 7
No Influence	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Decrease Expectations	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Don't Know	Statewide Teams: 2	Campus Teams: 3

10. In what way do you think that the grade specific PLDs will influence parent expectations for students in your state?

Increase Expectations	Statewide Teams: .5	Campus Teams: 4
No Influence	Statewide Teams: .5	Campus Teams: 1
Decrease Expectations	Statewide Teams:	Campus Teams:
Don't Know	Statewide Teams: 3	Campus Teams: 5

11. Please use this space to leave any comments on the PLDs not addressed by previous questions.

RESPONSES FROM STATEWIDE TEAMS

- a. There is no mention of correct use of and citation of sources**
- b. The PLDS for writing are exactly the same for grades 9, 10 & 11, there is no progression**
- c. For writing, focus more on current events and controversial issues and less on literature**
- d. Need smoother transitions**
- e. Make easier to read**
- f. Make more user-friendly**
- g. I am very curious to know how the PLDs will be used to assist those students with deficiencies such as learning disabilities (i.e. dyslexia, speech, visually impaired, etc.)**
- h. Need for professional development for K-12 teachers and university faculty.**
- i. There is a great need for professional development at every level**

RESPONSES FROM INDIVIDUAL UNIVERSITY TEAMS

- a. *ELA/Literacy PLDs would be less confusing if:*
- *ELA PLDs were set up like mathematics*
 - *Three areas separated: Literature, Information Vocabulary/Interpretation & Use*
 - *Levels/description under each category*
- b. *Language needs to more explicit (vague)*
- c. *Language currently is not precise enough to lend itself to measurement*
- d. *Language needs to be re-formatted so that there are clear and unmistakable differences between levels*
- e. *Grades 9 & 10 appear identical. Will teachers establish their own understandings of appropriate differences to expect/accept between 9th and 10th grade production of the same PLDs? Is it just a matter of different levels of reading materials for each grade?*
- f. *Seems like there's some general redundancy that could be reduced by combining some of the PLDs (see character-related PLDs under "Reading Literature" in 9th/10th, or RST1, and RH1 expectations for providing evidence under Reading Information in 9th/10th)*
- g. *For 9th/10th Vocabulary Interpretation and Use, what would "Provides a statement demonstrating accurate meaning and use of grade-appropriate general academic words and phrases" look like? Rephrase.*
- h. *In 9th, 10th, and 11th Reading and Vocabulary PLDs for Levels 4 and 5 are identical. Mitigating language is needed to differentiate Level 4 and Level 5.*
- i. *Change Reading summary at top of each grade level so that the "inferences" statement says "evaluate and support" rather than just "support."*
- j. *There is a lot of redundancy in the Reading sections. Categories can be combined.*
- k. *Why does English Language Arts have to cover Science/Technology/History texts?*
- l. *Can there simply be one document with high school ELA PLDs, since they're so similar across grades. That document could indicate differences among grades*
- m. *Bold differences between 1-5 to make clearer/simpler for teachers*
- n. *Seems premature to be filling out the general questionnaire when the PLDs still need work*
- o. *Level 3: the use of "moderate" is descriptive for me; I get it.*
- p. *Strong and distinguished are problematic. They are nebulous terms. Suggestion: "Use "skilled" versus "strong" and "highly skilled" versus "distinguished."*
- q. *Perhaps change "effective" to "adequate/competent" (these words are a bit more specific/descriptive)*
- r. *Student and parents may wonder why we need English IV if students score a 5 at the 11th grade level. We also wonder what parents might say if their child does score a 5*

and their child does not do well in entry level classes. I am also bothered about how it may be used in Louisiana's COMPASS teacher evaluation process.

- s. Print is too small*
- t. Writing should be separated from reading*
- u. Separate ELAs such that each focus area has its own page*
- v. Tremendous outreach to parents is needed*
- w. People doing outreach need to be confident*
- x. We need assessment models now*
- y. What do you do in their senior year - if you are saying they are college ready?*
- z. Concerned about over emphasis on testing at cost of instructional time*
- aa. What if a student could test continuously?*
- bb. There is a general concern regarding the level and/or type of PD provided across the board (i.e.; teachers, district leaders, parents, college professors)*
- cc. The writing PLDs should focus more on current events and/or controversial issues and less on literature*
- dd. Lack of attention to diagnostic feedback concerned about logistics of electronic testing environment; will "drill-down" data be provided*
- ee. Lack of attention to research, citation and plagiarism. There is a need for professional development for K-12 teachers and university faculty*
- ff. Develop template/sample items for PD*
- gg. Assessment does not address speaking/writing, all genre has been collapsed into 1 bullet*
- hh. Too much detail, especially in reading (are PLDs necessary?) bullets may distract*
- ii. What is the degree for each grade level? Hard to differentiate*